LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

TRUTH AND THE WAR

R.P.D.

August 1950

Price: One Shilling

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE 35th PARALLEL

THE 35th Parallel runs close to Pusan in Korea. About 40 miles south of that line in Japan and less than 200 miles to the east, ringed by U.S. bomber bases, lies—Hiroshima. Or, until that morning five years ago this week, there Hiroshima stood. And where do *we* stand today? In *Light On Korea*, published July 14, D. N. Pritt, K.C., soberly presented the true facts, to counter the lies and hysterical propaganda accompanying a disgraceful colonial war. Even while it was on the presses a clamour had gone up for the use of the atomic bomb, as Yank troops constantly fell back defeated—the authentic voice of the Might that Failed. *Light On Korea* ends by saying of the Peace Petition: 'The force of millions and scores of millions signing such Petitions all over the world and demanding the outlawry of atomic weapons and those who use them, will be enough to make even the most hysterical governments hesitate before imperilling the peace of the world out of their hatred and fear of socialism'. The repercussions of this remarkable *Labour Monthly* pamphlet are being felt throughout the Labour movement.

NO SKY-BLUE FLAG?

From Korea to South Africa. Here's a cutting a reader sent me, on the eve of the annexation of South-West Africa in contemptuous defiance of U.N.O. General Assembly: 'The war in Korea would be a fight for the preservation of white civilisation, and every member of the National Youth Movement would have to play his part, said Mr. J. Becker, retiring chairman of the Cape Province branch at the Nasionale Jeugbond congress'. (*Johannesburg Star*, 5.7.50.) No emergency meeting to denounce white-supremacy-crazed South Africans invading the Herero peoples' land? No American Commander-in-Chief ordering the Royal Navy into action under a sky-blue U.N.O. flag?

From an ex-senior officer in the Canadian forces comes interesting confirmation of the earlier origins of the Cold War (July Notes). A visiting London businessman in 1943 told him: 'I don't know what is going on, but everywhere over here—particularly in Canada—they are saying, "Watch Russia". We aren't talking like that in England'. Later our Canadian reader crossed to the Pacific coast; he was startled. '. . . On King Street, Toronto, two men were "Watching Russia" from the curb; an over-fed clerical gent in the train club car in Saskatchewan was telling a prosperous-looking business man that our war was not with Hitler, but "Watch Russia"; a day or so later a young Volunteer Reserve Lieutenant informed me at my first Pacific coast luncheon that it would soon be over, but "Watch Russia". My reply to this treacherous remark about our gallant ally need not be repeated'. Remember H. G. Wells' wartime disclosure of the diligently-organised anti-Russian whispering campaign, and the 'next war'?

Many readers have found time to write in recent weeks. A Kent bookseller wrote: 'The issue for July, 1950, is the best we have had for years, despite the very hard times and high standards you set yourselves. It brings back

Continued on inside back cover.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXII. No. 8

CONTENTS

August, 1950

Page

NOTES OF THE MONTH: Truth and the War, by R.P.D. 337

YANKEE AGGRESSION IN KOREA: by 'Quæstor' 349

TWO PIRATES OF FORMOSA: by Arthur Clegg 362

THE BOMB-MONGERS: by Ivor Montagu 366

THE FIRST THIRTY YEARS: by R. Page Arnot 371

FASCIST SOUTH AFRICA: by Sam Kahn 378

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO 384

Book Review:

Atomic Energy, edited by J. L. Crammer and R. E. Peierls; Atomic Attack, Association of Scientific Workers: *Atemnos* 382

CARTOON 360-1

Notes of the Month

Truth and the War

JUNE 25, 1950, will be remembered as the opening of the war offensive of the American Axis—as memorable a date as the German-Italian invasion of Spain in 1936. During the five years since 1945 there have been continuously local wars of aggression against national freedom conducted by each of the imperialist Powers separately—Britain in Greece and Malaya, France in Viet-Nam, Holland in Indonesia, and the United States in the Philippines and (through Chiang Kai-shek) in China. But the invasion of Korea is the first combined assault of the imperialist Powers acting as a single war-making coalition under a United States Commander-in-Chief, and seeking to misuse the flag of the United Nations for an illegal war of intervention.

From 1931 to 1950

It is worth recalling that the Second World War developed from the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, which was the preliminary to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the offensive against all East Asia. So today the instigators of a Third World War have begun with the invasion of Korea and aggression against Formosa, as a preliminary to declared offensive aims, set out in President Truman's Declaration of June 27, against all East Asia. Once again the war is directed from Tokyo as headquarters, this time under Mikado MacArthur, and once again it is proclaimed, in faithful imitation of the Japanese model, as a 'police operation' to hoodwink the innocent. But this time the world situation is different. Korea will neither be a second Spain nor a second Manchuria. The menace to world peace is increasingly serious and critical with every day of the new offensive. Only the powerful, unshakable will to peace, and refusal to be provoked, of the two greatest States in the world, the Soviet Union and the Chinese Republic, have so far prevented this reckless offensive from leading to a new world war. The epic fight of the Korean People's Army has won time for the peoples of the world to rally. If the assault on Korea is checked, world peace can still be saved.

Warning Voices

Last month we had the privilege to print in this journal the last article from the pen of Agnes Smedley, the honoured and indomitable champion of the cause of the people's freedom in the Far East, who was hounded to the last and hastened to her grave by the persecution of imperialism. Writing on March 11, with her unrivalled knowledge of the inner workings of Far Eastern affairs, she sounded the warning:

> A dreadful war plot is being hatched in the Far East, and it includes not only Formosa and Japan, but Indo-China. Yet the secret forces behind this plot are not yet known to the people of the world, certainly not to the peoples of Japan, America, Britain and the peoples of some of the countries of Europe. To expose and protest, and finally to appeal to the people of America in particular, is the rôle of every peaceable man of the Western world. But it must be done soon, otherwise the plot will reach its fulfilment in a new world war, beginning in the Far East.

This voice from the grave speaks to the unthinking multitude who are being tricked and trapped by cunning propaganda camouflage into the toils of the American war plot in the Far East. From the side of the war camp the Vice-President of the United States, Alben Barkley, gave the game away on May 22 when he announced that the United States was contemplating to 'occupy more countries. . . We must maintain armed forces all over the world'. In answer to the question which were the 'more countries' he had in mind, the State Department sought to cover up the indiscretion by suggesting

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that perhaps he meant ' only the Philippines '. June 25 has provided the answer to that question. Already in November, 1949, the Resolution of the Communist Information Bureau warned:

> It would be mistaken and harmful for the cause of peace to underestimate the danger of the new war that is being prepared by the imperialist Powers, headed by the United States of America and Britain. . .
>
> The experience of history teaches that the more hopeless the cause of imperialist reaction, the more it rages, the greater grows the danger of military adventures.

Maurice Thorez said in April: ' Peace hangs by a thread '. There were those who doubted these warnings as exaggerated. June 25 has given the answer to the doubters.

' Up Appeasers ! '

All the wolf-pack of Appeasers, who backed the fascist invasion of Spain, who acclaimed Franco and Hitler and Mussolini, who betrayed Spain and Austria and Czechoslovakia, in the name of the sacred crusade against the Soviet Union and Communism, and thus brought on the second world war, are now again in full cry acclaiming the American invasion of Korea and the combined imperialist assault on the Korean People's Republic. Michael Foot, in an article in the *Daily Herald* on July 7 entitled ' Up Appeasers! ', expressed surprise that all the former pro-fascist Appeasers who backed the invasion of Spain are now vociferously applauding the invasion of Korea, so that in the House of Commons ' the debate seemed to be transformed into a confessional for ex-appeasers '. He need not be surprised. It is the same crusade. It is the same slogans of the Holy War against the Soviet Union and Communism. It is the same backing of an infamous fascist dictator, who would not last a week without foreign armies and bombing planes, against the heroic struggle of a people fighting for their freedom and national independence. All the millions of tons of printer's ink poured out to spread the lying propaganda of imperialism cannot conceal this simple truth or whitewash the real aggressors.

Appeasers' New Recruit

Mr. Foot, who once supported Spanish Democracy against fascism, need not imagine in his innocence that the enemy camp have joined him. He has joined them. Can any sincere supporter of Spanish Democracy fail to recognise all the familiar features of a true People's War, the same heroism and miracles of achievement, of the Korean People's Army and partisans and the entire population against the foreign invading armies and their hated

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

puppet? The foreign bombing planes which rained death on Madrid and Barcelona and Guernica are now raining death, in boasted ' Coventry raids ', on Pyongyang, on women and children, on farmers in the fields, and destruction on the factories erected by the creative labour of a free people. Only this time we bear directly the blood guilt which was borne then by Hitler and Mussolini. Michael Foot may well sound the rallying cry ' Up Appeasers!' For no one can deny that Mr. Foot, who once denounced the appeasement of Hitler, has become a most servile Appeaser of American Imperialism, which is extending its fangs and tentacles, its armed bases and military occupations and expansion all over the world on a scale that Hitler's wildest dreams of expansion never dared to envisage.

Hypocrisy and Aggression

In all the long annals of imperialist crime and banditry against the freedom of nations no lower level has been reached than in the present assault of American imperialism and its satellites against Korea. When the British marauders conducted their infamous Opium Wars against China a century ago they did not pretend that the opium which they were forcing down Chinese throats at the cannon's mouth was good for the Chinese. When the six Powers of imperialism in 1900 sent their joint expedition to sack and loot Pekin, in order to suppress the Chinese popular movement, they burned and pillaged in the name of the ' rule of law ' and as the representatives of the ' united forces of civilisation '. But they did not attempt to disguise their action behind any claptrap about ' democracy ' or ' collective security ' or ' the rights of the Chinese nation '. They did represent all the World Powers as then constituted, and not a rump of Governments in the pay of the United States arrogating to themselves the title of the United Nations. They openly proclaimed their aim to protect imperialist interests against the Chinese popular revolt. They stood firmly for the Manchu dynasty against the Chinese people. The higher hypocrisy of aggression has been left for our day.

Painting Black White

The Koreans are solemnly arraigned, judged and condemned (without a hearing of course, without representation and with an express decision that they must not be allowed to state their case) as guilty of the crime of ' aggression '—against their own country! This is much as if the British under a Nazi occupation, involved in conflict with a hated quisling Gauleiter, were to be adjudged by a court of Nazi satellite Governments guilty of ' aggression ' against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

England. The invading imperialist armies, the bombarding warships, the Superfortresses engaged in round-the-clock terror-bombing, are solemnly declared to be acting in 'self-defence'. Since the open violation of the Charter, which only permits military enforcement action by a decision of the Security Council with the concurrence of the five Permanent Powers, has to be in practice admitted, Clause 51 is invoked, which permits an invaded country or countries the right of immediate self-defence without waiting for a decision. Thus the very clause which was devised to justify defence against invasion is twisted to justify invasion. While the people who are defending their country against foreign invasion are declared guilty of 'aggression', the foreign invaders are awarded a halo as exponents of 'self-defence'. Such is the climax which modern imperialist hypocrisy has devised to crown the ancient tactics of imperialist aggression.

Hard Lying

'But we must stand up against aggression'. With this formula the attempt is being made to bamboozle the people of America and Britain into support of a war of aggression. Mere 'legalistic' arguments about the Charter or the violation of the Charter, we are told, must not be allowed to impede us when we are faced with 'plain indisputable aggression'. Whose aggression? American or Korean? Jesting Pilate will not wait for an answer; he wants to get on with the war. But surely on a question of such importance, since both the North Korean and South Korean Governments alleged prior invasion by the other, it would be desirable to make some attempt to examine the evidence before jumping to a decision and an intervention which may mean world war? On the contrary; no evidence must be considered; this was the ruling of the little rump of Governments in the pay of the United States at Lake Success, which was convened in the small hours under American orders, docilely accepted the assertion of the American puppet Government without question, explicitly voted down a proposal to hear the case of the North Korean Government, and proceeded blithely to decisions which would mean Great Power intervention and war, and the possibility of world war. It is doubtful if in history war has ever been embarked upon by a grouping of Powers with such frivolous irresponsibility.

Hiding the Evidence

There is plenty of evidence the other way—to prove the culpable responsibility of the Syngman Rhee Government and their Ameri-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can backers, their open proclamation of their programme to invade North Korea, their boasts that they would occupy Pyongyang in three days, their vainglorious confidence that their American-trained army, 'the finest army in Asia', would make mincemeat of the North Korean People's Army. This damning evidence has been set out in D. N. Pritt's pamphlet *Light on Korea*. It is summarised in Quæstor's article in this number. It has never been answered—because there is no answer. It has simply been concealed from the people of America and Europe by the diplomatists and the millionaire press, because it would kill the case for the war. The monotonous assertion of 'aggression' by the Korean People's Government is ceaselessly repeated without evidence to create a mass hypnotism of acceptance. On this single assumption the entire edifice of argument of the apologists of war is built. What evidence is offered for this assumption? None. Nothing. Not one scrap, jot or tittle. Not one single report by a single eye-witness.

War Hysteria

The 'Security Council decision', we are told, 'proves' it. On the contrary; the Rump did not even attempt to consider the evidence, but ruled it out. The 'United Nations Commission for Korea', we are told, provided the 'unimpeachable evidence' of 'impartial observers'. Nothing of the kind. This precious body—also an illegal outfit dominated by Governments in the pay of the United States—did not even attempt to offer any evidence. It merely reported: 'Government of Korea states, etc.' So the whole grand allegation of 'aggression', on which the entire case of the Atlantic Axis warmongers is based, rests only and solely on the say-so of Syngman Rhee—a notorious blackguard who had publicly boasted in Washington that his slogan was 'the march on the North'. Mr. Attlee in the House of Commons on July 5 admitted that the Syngman Rhee régime might be an undesirable régime, but went on:

> I am not concerned to defend that Government or to estimate whether it is good or bad. I never knew that the excuse for assaulting somebody who is peacefully proceeding on his way was that his character was not awfully good.

A typical circular argument. For if the entire allegation of assault rests solely on the say-so of the notorious bad hat who was boasting the moment before that he would commit aggression and is now getting a hiding, Mr. Attlee's entire case falls to the ground. It is manifest that we are here dealing, not with any attempt to consider reasoned evidence, but with war hysteria.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Real War Plot

It is necessary to get away from this atmosphere of war hysteria, and of noisy self-justification and phony arguments without evidence dinned out by the war camp, in order to examine seriously and in a responsible fashion the real significance of the present war offensive and its consequences for the prospect of the world situation and the fight for peace. Why did the United States Government decide to launch this war offensive at this moment in the Far East, utilising Syngman Rhee as its puppet and Korea as its pretext, manipulating the United Nations machinery in flagrant violation of the Charter, and on this basis compelling the far from happy acquiescence of its satellites to drag them into war? President Truman's War Declaration of June 27, preceding any pretence of a United Nations decision for military measures, made plain that Korea is being used as a pretext, but that the objectives of the offensive extend far beyond Korea. He gave orders for military action specifically covering (1) Korea, (2) Formosa, (3) the Philippines, (4) Indo-China. This is not a local operation. It is a war offensive for the whole Far East. It is a direct challenge to the Chinese People's Republic, through the military seizure of Formosa, recognised by the Allies, including the United States Government, as part of the national territory of China. It is a direct provocation to the Soviet Union. It is therefore either a deliberate preparation for world war or at least a calculated risk of world war. Only the will to peace of the Soviet Union and China has so far saved humanity from world war. But if the American militarists have calculated on that will to peace as meaning that they can run amok anywhere in the world, as the fancy takes them, it is obvious that they are playing with fire. The question is resounding in the minds of the people of the whole world: Where is this war aggression leading? Where will it end?

Crisis of the War Camp

Last month we examined the Crisis of the Cold War, and the controversy which was developing even among sections of its former supporters, in view of the impasse and fiasco to which it had led. Fiasco in the Far East, with the final collapse of the American six billion dollar war through Chiang Kai-shek against the Chinese people. Fiasco in South East Asia, with the increasing strength of the national liberation movements against the imported troops, and the French semi-official journal *Monde* coming out openly with the proposal (just two days before the Korean War) that France should abandon the war in Indo-China, which was bleeding France white

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and only profiting American interests. Fiasco of the illusions of atom bomb monopoly. Fiasco of the Atlantic Powers Conference in London, where the Western European countries refused to swallow the American plan for doubling their war expenditure, and Acheson had to return with vague generalities about a 'balanced collective strategy':

> At the Hague meeting this spring the Atlantic Defence officials wrapped the maximum defence requirements of every participating country into a huge, ungainly bundle, and called the monstrous result a 'plan'. At the subsequent Brussels meeting the European Finance Ministers took one look at what this 'plan' would cost and threw up their hands in horror. There the matter now rests. Joint American-European defence planning is stalled at dead centre.
>
> (Alsop Brothers, *New York Herald Tribune*, July 11, 1950.)

Thus not only in the Far East, but also in Europe the American Cold War policy had reached an impasse.

Revolt Against the Cold War

On every side the demand was rising for an ending of the American Cold War policy and a return to a policy for peace. No longer only on the left, but on all sides American policy was becoming identified with the aim of a third world war.

> Underneath the surface the tide of opinion is running against the United States in both Europe and Asia. Resistance to United States' ideas is growing. Irritation with United States power and behaviour is mounting. United States popularity overseas is fading. . .
>
> The average person in Europe or around the rim of Asia recoils from war. He wants no part in it. And he is beginning to blame the United States . . . for pushing the world towards a third world war.
>
> (*United States News and World Report*, June 2, 1950.)

The *New York Times* correspondent Sulzberger, summing up the outcome of a tour of European and Asiatic countries, recorded the same conclusion. Especially in Asia he noted the general conviction that

> . . . we are imperialist, racist, colonialist, fascist exploiters.

Similarly, Walter Lippman wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune* on June 1:

> The administration's foreign policy during the past year has created the impression here and abroad that it places virtually complete dependence upon military and material power. . . That this impression has been created and that it has spread around the world is certain. . . It is reflected abroad in a drastic decline of American popularity among the broad masses of the people. . . We have allowed ourselves to become identified

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the idea that war is inevitable and that our whole foreign policy is determined by the strategic necessities of the United States.

This was the conception which found expression in the description of the *Economist* (May 27): 'On the one side, the Americans and their cold war. On the other side, the Russians and Picasso's dove of peace'.

Peace or War

In this way American post-war policy had reached a sharp dilemma by the summer of 1950. The original Cold War programme, enunciated in the Truman Doctrine of 1947, was bankrupt. Its entire strategy in Eastern Asia had ended in collapse; and different sections of American ruling opinion were still wrangling what alternative should follow. Even its hold on Western Europe was weakening, not yet in an economic or military sense, but in the mounting popular hostility, the restiveness of Governments and universal distrust of the Atlantic military programme. The World Peace Movement was advancing in all countries and the Stockholm Peace Petition was mobilising hundreds of millions for the outlawing of the atom bomb. Acheson had brought back no real success from London; France was openly hinting at neutrality in the event of an American war in Europe; and even Britain was proving recalcitrant over the Schuman Plan. The demand to end the Cold War was gathering force, not only in popular support, but in varied influential quarters; and its advocates were thrown on the defensive. Thus the American aggressive policy was finding itself faced with a critical situation comparable in some respects with that which faced Hitler in the spring of 1938, when the united resistance of the peoples of Europe barred his road to Czechoslovakia. The leaders of American imperialism had to choose between two alternatives. Either to abandon the Cold War programme and return to a policy of peace and Great Power co-operation. Or to plunge deeper into aggression, stake all on a military gamble, and seek to cut the Gordian knot with the sword, by opening a direct war offensive in Eastern Asia, forcing the hesitant Western European Governments to align themselves behind the war, and thus fanning anew the smouldering embers of war tension. June 25 showed which path was chosen.

MacArthur's Military Gamble

Up to June, 1950, two schools of thought in the American war camp had been engaged in conflict for mastery. One, the more 'moderate' school, officially dominant, and expressed by Truman and Acheson, had sought to pursue a more cautious policy of build-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing up the military alliance and strategic preparations for a future war. The other 'extremist' school, represented by MacArthur, Dulles, Johnson (previously Forrestal), Hoover, Taft and the more bellicose Republicans, had demanded a more forward aggressive policy of action, specifically in Eastern Asia. Before June the full programme of this school had been repudiated, though MacArthur had been left a free hand to exercise his emperorship in Tokyo and intrigue unrestrainedly in American politics. Not only had Korea been officially declared outside the American military sphere of interest, but the MacArthur programme for aggressive military action on Formosa had been solemnly rejected by President Truman's Declaration of January 5 that 'the U.S. Government will not provide military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa' and Acheson's parallel statement that 'we are not going to get involved militarily in any way on the island of Formosa'.

> Three days before the President's flat denial of American obligations in Formosa, Senator Robert Taft, ex-President Herbert Hoover, and Senator Knowland had come out with the then amazing suggestion that the United States should use the navy to protect Formosa.
>
> On January 1 these famous 'reactionary' voices were called warmongers hopelessly out of touch with what the State Department previously knew to be 'the realities' of the situation on Korea and Formosa. Mr. Hoover and Senator Taft have had to wait six months to see their suggestion confidently seized by President Truman and universally praised as a sign of American courage and realism.
>
> (Alistair Cooke in the *Manchester Guardian*, June 29, 1950.)

The first sign of this impending reversal of policy was the appointment of the Republican Dulles as Adviser to Acheson in April. There followed the Tokyo Conference of Dulles, General Bradley and Defence Secretary Johnson with General MacArthur in the middle of June, less than a fortnight before the opening of hostilities. By June 17 Dulles was in Seoul and visiting 'the front', as well as delivering an inflammatory address in Seoul against 'compromise' and guaranteeing American support. The train of powder was laid, and the explosion followed on June 25. General MacArthur had won American policy for his military gamble.

The Plot that Went Wrong

Just as Hitler, once the balance of forces had gathered against him, plunged from blunder to blunder, so the reckless and criminal adventure of American imperialism in advancing to direct war aggression with its Far Eastern offensive has only revealed its politi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cal and strategic miscalculations. The military gamble was based on the assumption of quick victory and a *fait accompli* ('Pyongyang in three days'). This illusion of the American military experts was smashed at the outset. The second assumption was that American air and naval intervention would be sufficient (still the line of President Truman's Declaration on June 27)—the old illusion of press-button war and fighting with the bodies of other nations, in accordance with the wisdom of Clarence Cannon ('The United States must be prepared to equip the soldiers of other nations and let them send their boys into the holocaust, so that we won't have to send our boys'). That illusion was pricked within five days. They had forgotten the lesson from their billions wasted on Chiang Kai-shek that no puppet army maintained by a foreign Power can fight a People's Army fighting for their country. The Superman had to step down from his pedestal. United States troops had to be ordered from comfortable garrison billets where they had been lords of the earth to fight in the field against the despised 'gooks'—that is, against peasant warriors who were fighting on their own soil amid their own people for their own freedom. The outcome staggered the complacent ignorance of the 'civilised' world of imperialism, and demonstrated anew Mao Tse-tung's wise words on the 'paper tiger'. 'It was hoped that the mere appearance of American soldiers would cause the Communists to withdraw. It didn't work out that way' (*News Chronicle,* July 7). The third illusion of American invincibility received a heavy blow, as the high and mighty magnates of the empire of the colour bar, White supremacy and Anglo-Saxon racialism realised that they were being taught a lesson by the Korean nation of less than 30 millions, and that their dreams of quick and easy victory would have to give place to a prolonged and unpopular war.

World War or World Peace

The Korean People's Army has written a deathless page in the epic struggle for human freedom. They have inspired new heart and confidence in every people struggling against imperialist domination. They have given new inspiration to the workers and common people of the whole world who are struggling against the American warmakers and their satellites for a world of peace and freedom. But that struggle is now reaching its highest point of urgency. The criminals of American imperialism who let loose the war are preparing to lash out with renewed fury. They are demanding land forces from all their satellites, and from Britain in the first place.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By their military aggression on Formosa they are threatening to extend the war. The barbarian clamour for the use of the atom bomb rises. The Churchills and their company are fanning the agitation for a new world war. Now is the time when the fight for Korean freedom is indissolubly linked with the fight for world peace. It is the peoples of America, Britain and Europe who must stop this aggression. Britain must not be dragged behind the United States in a criminal war which could extend to all East Asia and even to world war. Unity of the British people finally checked the hands of their warmaking Government and established indissoluble bonds of solidarity with the Soviet people in the mighty Hands Off Russia campaign 30 years ago, in the year of the foundation of the Communist Party. That unity is more than ever needed now in the present hour of decision of world history. The Stalin-Nehru interchange has provided a basis for a peaceful solution. The Security Council of the United Nations must be allowed to function legally for peace. Hands Off Korea! Save World Peace!

July 20, 1950. R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

YANKEE AGGRESSION IN KOREA

QUÆSTOR

These new adventures undertaken by the U.S. Government demonstrate that its plans to dominate Asia by means of its puppets have failed and the American imperialists have to come out into the open and carry out direct military intervention. When a rat runs through a street, everybody shouts 'Kill it'. This U.S. imperialist rat is now running through the streets of Asia with its real features exposed and the result is that the Asian people are saying 'Kill it'.

Statement of the Chinese People's Foreign Affairs Society.

FOR many years the Wall Street bullies carried out indirect military aggression against the Chinese people, supplying oil and scrap iron to the Japanese invaders to 'soften up' China and so force it to yield concessions to American trusts. From 1945 onwards Wall Street used Chiang Kai-shek as its puppet for the same purpose, sending 'planes, bombs, guns and American uniformed thugs to help him. In 1948-9 the Chinese people girded up their loins and in a series of mighty efforts threw both the rat Chiang Kai-shek and his Wall Street thugmasters ('men whose life was a round of poker, booze, blackmarketing and lechery'—Honor Tracy in *Kakemono*) out of China.

The history of Korea for 70 years has been a miniature of the history of the Chinese people's struggles for freedom—with Japan as the advance guard of imperialist aggression, so long as she would serve, and the Wall Street thugs coming out into the open in 1945, when they had no alternative. For five years the Americans' presence in Korea has been one long racket of bloody aggression, corruption and Tammany Hall manipulation of their puppet Syngman Rhee. He tried his brazen provocations once too often last month—and this time the Korean people have been ready for him: and the American flesh-eating buzzard is deafening the world with its screams for help.

1. America and Korea, 1871-1919

When the Great Powers, headed by the United Kingdom, were battering their way into the Chinese market with the help of warships and punitive expeditions in the middle years of the nineteenth century, it was the United States which, in June, 1871, took the initiative in Korea—then under Chinese suzerainty. The U.S. navy,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supported by ships of other States, bombarded the Korean coast in order to impose a treaty ' for the protection of mariners '. Again it was the United States, in June, 1882, which was the first pillar of Western civilisation to impose an ' unequal treaty ' on Korea, opening up four ports to its traders and giving them extra-territorial rights—in exchange for a vague promise (Art. 1) that, if any third Power ' acted unjustly ' to Korea, the U.S.A. would use its ' good offices ' to secure redress.

How valuable this assurance was could be seen during the great peasants' anti-feudal rising in Korea of 1894, known as the ' Ton-Hak ' movement, from the name of the religious sect which headed it. Japan took advantage of the difficulties encountered by the Chinese Imperial troops to send in large forces, dig herself into Korea and set up a puppet government which declared war on China and ' appealed for help ' to Japan. In the consequent war between China and Japan the United States declared that it would do nothing to restrain Japan beyond expressing ' extreme disappointment '—and in the subsequent peace negotiations China's ' adviser ', in reality the United States unofficial representative, John Foster (true forerunner of John Foster Dulles 50 years later), took Japan's side on important issues, securing her a predominant position in Korea (nominally declared ' independent of China ') and the handing over to her of Formosa by the treaty of Shimonoseki (1895). The Japanese bloodily suppressed the peasant rising.

There followed ten years of intrigues and counter-intrigues in Korea by Japan and Tsarist Russia—on whom the Korean Government had to lean, for default of the great Western champion of liberty (busy between 1896 and 1904 annexing Hawaii, fighting Spain to take away Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines, fighting the people of the Philippines in order to take away their independence, and engineering a 'revolution' in the Panama district of the Republic of Colombia because the latter's Parliament rejected the scheme for an American-owned canal across its territory). Rivalries in Korea led to the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-5, in which victorious Japan made a clean sweep of all influences in Korea except her own. A secret protocol (July 29, 1905) recorded an agreement between the Japanese envoy Katsura and U.S. Secretary of State Taft, under which the latter recognised Japan's seizure of Korea in exchange for Japan's renouncing all claims to the Philippines.

Naturally, when the Korean Emperor appealed four months later to the U.S.A. under the 1882 pact, for protection against the forcible imposition of a ' treaty ' by the Japanese, destroying even the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nominal independence of his country, President Theodore Roosevelt ignored the appeal. A great peasant uprising in 1905-7 was again crushed by the Japanese. In 1907, travelling in Japan, Roosevelt urged the world to support Japan's work of 'transforming Korea' and 'striving to extend justice and education to a backward people'. In reality, the barefaced rapacity and brutal repressions of the Japanese occupying forces and business firms in Korea were rarely equalled even in the annals of the Japanese Empire. When Japan announced the annexation of Korea in August, 1910, the United States—one might justly say—were the first to keep quiet (having decided, that same year, to 'pick up' Liberia, America's first foothold in the African Continent).

In 1919 there came more display of American friendship. Deeply moved by the great liberation struggles of the Russian Revolution, and encouraged by President Woodrow Wilson's propaganda of self-determination and freedom of small nationalities, the Korean people launched a great struggle for freedom. On March 1 a vast demonstration of 100,000 people at Seoul (in all Korean towns a total of a million) heard read a 'Declaration of Independence' drawn up by all Korean political and religious bodies, and acclaimed the hoisting of a national flag. On April 11, in Shanghai, a Provisional Government in exile was formed, and a provisional Constitution was adopted. In Korea, at first, the movement took the form of passive resistance: and the Japanese took full advantage of it. Seven thousand Koreans were killed, 46,000 wounded, 49,000 jailed. Only gradually did the Koreans adopt guerilla methods, against which the Japanese had to fight hard for over a year. Meanwhile, the middle class emigrés hopefully set out on a delegation to the Paris Peace Conference, pleading for recognition of their country's independence, and sent a special mission to Washington, D.C., confident in the support of their great friend the United States and its 'Democrat' President.

Alas, passive methods and guerilla warfare, diplomatic approaches and historical memoranda, were all one to the Government of Wall Street. In 1919 it was co-operating with Japan in invading the territory of Soviet Russia and trying to crush the Socialist revolution there. Would it quarrel with Japan over some self-determination nonsense in Korea? Like hell it would! The Japanese went on with the massacre, and the American delegation at Versailles went on with its bargaining. In a painful and costly school, the Korean people learned their lesson.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They began to apply it long before August, 1945, when the Japanese military power in Asia collapsed. Thousands of Korean patriots fought for many years with the Chinese People's Liberation Army or with its partisan auxiliaries against the Japanese—carrying on the traditions of 1894-5 and 1905-7. When the Japanese Kwangtung Army surrendered to the Soviet forces and the latter entered Korea, the people rose to meet them. People's Committees, representing all political groupings and all classes—workers, peasants, employers (other than Japanese collaborators) and small traders—were formed in all towns and villages (in Southern Korea by August 31, there were 145 in existence). On September 6, a Congress of these Committees at Seoul set up a Central People's Committee and proclaimed a People's Republic. The Command of the Soviet Forces, in an ' Address to the Korean People ' the previous month, had already told them that they were now able ' to embark upon free creative work. . . Everything now depends upon yourselves. . . You yourselves must become the creators of your own happiness '. The Central People's Committee issued a programme of far-reaching democratic changes, including repeal of all Japanese laws; confiscation of lands which had belonged to Japanese and collaborators, and their distribution free to the peasants; nationalisation of banks, railways, and industries which had belonged to the Japanese and collaborators; freedom of speech, press and organisation. Everywhere the People's Committees set about putting these essential reforms into effect, breaking the economic and political power of the foreigner and his agents over the Korean nation.

But on September 8 the Americans landed in South Korea—nominally to receive the surrender of the Japanese forces there, but actually for a very different purpose, as they were not long in showing. General MacArthur immediately issued a characteristic proclamation of his own. All administrative power south of the 38th Parallel, he announced, ' is under my jurisdiction '. The people must obey orders issued ' over my signature '. Violations of order and tranquillity would be ' mercilessly and severely punished '. English was to be the official language. Without delay, all people's committees in ' his ' territory were dispersed and their property confiscated. Practically the whole police and administrative machinery of the Japanese was taken over by the Americans. Only after big protest demonstrations was Abe, the Japanese Governor-General, dismissed. An ' Advisory Council ' was set up, composed of big Korean landlords, manufacturers and bankers who had collaborated with the Japanese.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its head, Kim Seung-Soo, one of the biggest landowners and industrialists in Korea, had controlled the Japanese 'Mobilisation League' which recruited Koreans for compulsory labour or military service. Another, Li Sung-Seul, had headed the Japanese organisation for abolishing the Korean language. The 'Eastern Colonisation Society'—the economic agency of the Japanese Government—was merely renamed the 'New Korea Company', and continued to own and administer (with the same personnel as before) all the lands, factories and other property which had belonged to the Japanese. Landlords continued to rule villages, and peasants continued in their miserable conditions. A characteristic appointment—as Deputy Mayor of Seoul—was Kim Chang-Yung, a member of the Japanese police who had received a reward of 150,000 Yen for betraying several Korean patriots to the executioner. The trade unions and factory committees which sprang into existence in all towns and industries of Korea—over 500 delegates attended the first T.U.C. in November, 1945—found themselves first ignored, then obstructed, and finally subjected to repression and arrest in the American zone. Within a few months, mass shootings had begun—just as under the Japanese.

In short, the American generals had stepped into the shoes of the Mikado. *From September, 1945, the United States has been at war with the Korean people, an aggressor in Korean territory as real as the Japanese.*

This reality of the situation in Korea is not to be hidden by the fact that, by gerrymandering the elections according to the best combined traditions of Tammany Hall and Hitler, MacArthur and his subordinate Hodge succeeded at a later stage—after having proscribed and driven underground the Korean mass organisations—in getting a more or less obedient 'Assembly' elected in May, 1948. The true situation, before repression had completed its work, was shown by Edgar Snow, the well-known American journalist, in the spring of 1946. He wrote in the *Saturday Evening Post*:

> The American military administration allowed a direct secret ballot in three districts, and the nominees of the 'People's Republic' Coalition were elected by an overwhelming majority. Dr. Underwood (Adviser to Gen. Hodge) told me that he had learned that elections to local municipalities now would undoubtedly and almost everywhere bring to power representatives of the 'People's Republic' Coalition. But our experiment was never repeated.

The contrast between the two policies—the Soviet policy of helping the Koreans to make their country safe for the common man, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American policy of helping rich Koreans to make their country safe for American investors and American bases—was displayed most strikingly in the long-drawn-out attempts to get the Joint Commission of the Soviet and American Commands in Korea to work effectively. In December, 1945, the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers had decided that this body was to consult with all democratic Korean parties and social organisations about the formation of a Provisional Democratic Government, subject to approval by the Powers: and was to work out, with that Government, provisions for joint trusteeship for five years. The Commission sat from March to May, 1946, and—in a renewed effort to reach agreement —from April to August, 1947. Each time these efforts broke down, it was because of American determination to make Korea safe for the invading Wall Street investor.

The Americans tried the now familiar and well-worn trick of pretending that the deadlock was due to 'different conceptions of democracy'—the Russians, they alleged, only allowing Communists and near-Communists to be classed as democratic, while the broad-minded Americans want pro-capitalists to be included. This fake was already exposed on January 9, 1946, when the five main Korean parties, of which only one was Communist or anything near it, issued a joint statement welcoming the Moscow Conference decisions. As soon as the Commission got to work, however, the real issues were revealed. The Americans refused to recommend for the list of organisations to be consulted such giant bodies in South Korea as the Peasants' Union (3,000,000 members), the Confederation of Labour (600,000 members) and the Women's League (800,000 members), i.e., precisely those bodies whose demands, if carried into effect by the Korean Provisional Government, would rescue the country once and for all from the insinuating tentacles of foreign capitalism, while leaving freedom of development for the class struggle at home. On the other hand, of a list of 20 organisations which the Americans did recommend, only three were among the five main parties. The other 17, more or less small groups, expressly repudiated the Moscow decisions on five years' trusteeship—which meant repudiating the right of the Great Powers to keep watch against possible rebirth of Fascist organisations. With the U.S.A. relying chiefly on Japanese collaborators in administration and economy, the aim of this move was obvious. Try as the Russians might, they could not overcome this paramount obstacle.

Even in the midst of the second series of talks, the Americans

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

underlined where they stood (from May to August, 1947) by arranging for mass arrests of trade union and Labour Party, peasant union and women's union leaders, closing down of their headquarters, publishing houses and newspapers, breaking up their demonstrations, and so forth. A visiting delegation of the World Federation of Trade Unions, including Ernest Bell of the British T.U.C. and representatives of the American C.I.O., was an eyewitness of these brutalities in April, 1947, recording in its report ' the brutal repression of trade union activity . . . rule by persons chosen from the privileged classes (and) suspected of collaborating with the Japanese . . . organised terror (which) deprives the Korean people of their right to exercise the freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of political expression and freedom of trade union organisation . . . a country where the most extreme reaction reigns . . . excesses of police action . . . inflation greatly aggravated by black market operations '. The American Military Governor, Maj.-Gen. Archer Lerch, gave them exactly $1\frac{1}{2}$ minutes of his time to make their strong protest.

This was the régime of an alien invader, operating through native thugs. The Wall Street bully was in full control. By May, 1950, 30 per cent. of all industry was owned by American firms.

Needless to say, a totally different situation met their eyes in Northern Korea, where crowds of cheering workers met them at every station. They found complete freedom of trade union activity, an eight-hour day, equal pay for equal work, wages up tenfold since the end of Japanese rule, 90 per cent. of industry nationalised, social insurance operating, sweeping educational improvements, land reform effected (in reality, over 700,000 peasant families had been given land at the expense of collaborators). There was universal suffrage, and secret ballot, under which the People's Committees had been re-elected in town and country in November, 1946, nearly 100 per cent. of all voters going to the poll, and 9,500 women being elected out of a total of 65,000 councillors. By May, 1950, industrial and agricultural production in North Korea—owned by the people—had far exceeded pre-liberation figures. There were 70 per cent. more elementary schoolchildren, and 23 times as many secondary schoolchildren, as in 1944.

This was the régime of the Korean people, governing themselves —thanks to the initial help from the U.S.S.R. It was the régime of which the 20 million people of South Korea were deprived—thanks to the American invader and aggressor.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In May, 1948, the Americans 'arranged' elections in their zone, despite protests from all Korean political parties. They secured their puppet Assembly, although when it came to voting an 'appeal' to the United Nations to 'leave' American troops in South Korea (November, 1948) 107 of its 200 members could not be found, and the 'appeal' was voted by only 88 to two, with three abstentions. By this time, a separate election for all Korea had been organised from the North (August) and although in Southern Korea the poll had to be taken secretly, so great was the influence of the left parties (who had boycotted the fake American elections) that 77 per cent. of the voters took part. The average for all Korea was 85 per cent., and in the National Assembly out of 527 members, 360 came from the South. In the autumn, the Soviet forces left the country. American forces only withdrew in June, 1949, leaving a Military Mission of 500 officers and men behind them—not only with desks at the Ministry of National Defence, but 'also assigned to the South Korean units in the field, down to regimental and sometimes battalion level' (*New York Times* Seoul correspondent, March 14, 1950). It was 'an army which is a fine watchdog over investments placed in this country', General Roberts, head of the Mission, asked the *New York Herald Tribune* correspondent to tell 'the American taxpayer' (June 5, 1950). 'I have at least 13 to 14 Americans with each division', he boasted. 'They work with the Korean officers, they live right there with them at the front—the 38th parallel—and stay with them in battles and in rest periods'. It was a demonstration of 'how an intelligent and intensive investment of 500 combat-hardened American officers and men can train 100,000 guys who will do the shooting for you'.

The American invader was sure that the army he had built up from among 20,000,000 *Koreans whom he had enslaved would 'do the shooting' against* 8,000,000 *Koreans who were free.*

3. The Bully Miscalculated

For many months the Americans and their agents had been preparing to begin the shooting, which began at last on June 25, 1950, after two days' preliminary bombardment of North Korean territory, with the entry of South Korean forces at three points into North Korea. A mass of evidence, to be found in D. N. Pritt's new pamphlet, 'Light on Korea' (*Labour Monthly*, 3d.), and in the Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee's *Bulletin* (July 17, 1950) has been steadily coming to light in spite of the efforts of the British Press to hide it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

' The march on the North is the most important task ' (Syngman Rhee at Washington, 24.10.1948). ' The South Korean Army wants to cross the border ' (*Herald Tribune* Seoul correspondent, 29.8.1949). ' We could capture Pyongyang in three weeks ' (Syngman Rhee in *New York Times,* 8.10.1949). ' I would wage war—but for this American help is needed ' (Syngman Rhee on U.S.S. ' St. Paul ', 31.10.1949). ' If we had our own way we would, I am sure, have started up already ' (Defence Minister Sihn Sung Mo to press correspondents, *Herald Tribune,* 1.11.1949). ' The hour of Korean unification is drawing near. . . We shall not be much longer without allies' (Syngman Rhee at Seoul, *Manchester Guardian,* 2.3.1950). Thirteen deputies of the South Korean Assembly jailed for ' opposing the invasion of North Korea by the South Korean forces ' (*New York Times* Seoul correspondent, 14.3.1950). ' There is a very real desire on the part of South Koreans to attack North Korea ', restrained only by the U.S. authorities who kept them short of ammunition (*New York Times* correspondent Richard Johnston, Press Club, 27.4.1950). ' One hundred thousand officers and men of the South Korean Army, equipped with American arms and trained by the American Military Mission, have completed their preparations and can start a war at any moment ' (Marshall administrator Johnson at Appropriations Commission of House of Representatives, 19.5. 1950). Syngman Rhee at the Seoul National Assembly: ' We shall win victory in a hot war '. John Foster Dulles, adviser to Secretary of State Acheson, replied that U.S.A. was ready ' to give all necessary moral and material support to South Korea fighting Communism '. (19.6.1950). ' Korea does not stand alone. . . My talks with General MacArthur will be followed by positive action ' (Dulles when leaving Korea, 21.6.1950).

Thus, on the very eve of the outbreak of war, the Americans took the brake off. They were ready. Their ' intelligent and intensive investment ' was about to bear fruit. Trained by ' 13 to 14 Americans with each division ', their puppet army could begin. Leave was stopped on June 24, captured officers have revealed.

' But weren't the Northerners ready, too?' Indeed they were. They would have been fools not to be—after the torrent of warlike propaganda emanating from the Americans and their native thugs. *They would have been particular fools, since there had been a preliminary tryout a year ago—in July, 1949.* Sygnman Rhee's own Minister of the Interior, Kim I Sek, broadcast over the Seoul radio, after deserting his American masters, that an invasion was planned for July 15, 1949, and was only prevented by large-scale guerilla

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action. On August 5, 1949, the Southern Chief of Staff admitted that the Northerners had retaken two points 'north of the 38th parallel' which his troops had occupied.

'But the Southerners weren't adequately equipped'. That was not the opinion of the American military men, quoted earlier. In the first three days, the Northerners captured 12 mortars, six anti-tank guns, 140 motor vehicles, over 500 machine guns. Foreign correspondents during the first ten days of their advance described the masses of abandoned arms and equipment which the Southerners wouldn't use. And, still more significant, they sent messages like these. 'The morale of the Southern forces has been none too good. . . (A northern column) pierced two full Republican divisions with little or no resistance'. (*The Times* Lake Success correspondent, 26.6.1950). 'The South Korean troops had offered no resistance in the last 12 miles to the city limits' (Reuter Tokyo correspondent, 27.6.1950, quoting an American radio from Seoul). 'In spite of denials in Tokyo, there are persistent reports of widespread dissident action behind the Republican positions' (*The Times* Lake Success correspondent, 29.6.1950). 'Resistance by the South Korean forces seems slight' (*The Times* Tokyo correspondent, 4.7.1950). It was the lack of the will to fight, not lack of equipment, that was the trouble. The Americans understood this too late. A supremely ridiculous effort was cabled by *The Times* correspondent on July 3: 'American aircraft had dropped leaflets in Korean, 'designed to bolster morale', on their own side.

Yet the Americans might have remembered that they had equipped Chiang Kai-shek's armies with tanks, 'planes and guns as they did in Korea: and all of this had proved without avail against the People's Liberation Army. They themselves, very early in the present fighting, let loose the most savage terror against the Korean civil population. Their aircraft murdered thousands of civilians in 'Coventry raids' on the Northern capital and towns and villages. The police and Korean troops under their command massacred hundreds of civilian prisoners and guerillas, under the eyes of American correspondents who reported these acts. But the terror did not weaken the morale of the armies fighting for the liberation of their country from the foreign invader: on the contrary. Nearly 600,000 young Koreans, over 100,000 of them girls, volunteered for military service in the first fortnight. The former commander-in-chief of the South Korean forces, in a broadcast on July 4, announced the formation of a volunteer army of his former soldiers to fight the Americans. Syngman Rhee's former Minister of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Interior went over to the Northerners, under the influence of this avalanche of feeling. So did most South Korean M.P.s.

Just as in China, the bloody invasion of the American bullies has roused the Korean people in a holy war for the liberation of their country. The announcement of the extension of agrarian reform to Southern Korea (July 7) redoubled their determination, in spite of the faked and illegal Security Council decision—adopted in brazen violation of the rules demanding unanimity of the five permanent members, and impudently extending to the American invasion of Korea the rule allowing 'self defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations' (article 51). In spite of the servile agreement of the Labour Government to enlist British ships, 'planes and men under MacArthur's command, the war in Korea becomes daily more and more a war against the whole Korean people, on the part of a most brutal, most callous, most ruthless enemy—American Imperialism, distinguished from its predecessor the Japanese not by any less ferocity but solely by greater hypocrisy.

The American bully miscalculated in his preparations within Korea. Did he miscalculate in relying on the docility of the British people? Did he miscalculate in accepting the assurances of the most obsequious and anti-patriotic of British Governments since Charles II sold his country's interests to the King of France? To that the British workers' most vital interests—the lives of their sons sent out to Korea, the lives of the British people menaced by America's plans for a new world war to develop out of its Korean adventure—require that they should give a speedy and unmistakable answer.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S RE

The First Tractor Arrives

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIC

By Li Chi

★ Translation

Hear, hear, hear! See, see, see!
Grand trial of farm machines!
Inspect this one, inspect that,
Ploughs, reapers, all complete.

City workers strive hard,
Build machines for us;
Now if we only make full use,
Abundant food, clothing and ten thousand years' happiness.

Chairman Mao, Chairman Mao,
You it is who plan for us,
You we shall support for ever,
You we shall support for ever.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO PIRATES OF FORMOSA

ARTHUR CLEGG

'THE United States', said President Truman on January 5 this year in a statement which, to make it more impressive, he read to his press conference that day, 'has no predatory designs on Formosa, or any other Chinese territory . . . Nor does it have any intention of utilizing its armed forces to interfere in the present situation'. To make doubly sure he was understood he added that the United States 'will not pursue a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China'. Less than six months later, on June 27, President Truman, in a statement which this time he did not dare to read, reversed the position. He said 'I have ordered the Seventh Fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa', that is an 'attack' by Chinese. He went on, 'The determination of the future status of Formosa must await the restoration of security in the Pacific, a peace settlement with Japan, or consideration by the United Nations'.

This latter declaration was issued completely unilaterally by the American Government. Not one shred or vestige of 'United Nations' covering could be found. Aggression, however, it is, so stark and naked that not one of the vassals of the United States dare try to justify it—save the 'government' of Chiang Kai-shek. Mr. Truman, perforce, therefore had to attempt to provide a bit of covering for himself. Apart from invoking the situation in Korea, which America had itself provoked to provide some sort of excuse for seizing Formosa, he wrote 'As a corollary to this action I am calling upon the Chinese Government (!) of Formosa to cease all air and sea operations against the mainland. The Seventh Fleet will see that this is done'.

This pretence lasted a bare ten days. Then Chiang Kai-shek announced that his warships had been again instructed to search and seize all Chinese vessels, and that air reconnaissance over the mainland would be resumed. Next day a British boat was stopped and searched by Chiang's naval vessels. The pirate of Taipeh had resumed his operations.

Of British journals, *The Economist*, almost alone, has rushed in to curry favour with the Americans (having already once this year earned a pat on the back from Secretary Acheson for its warlike

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

utterances on Far Eastern matters) by searching for arguments to diminish the shock of such open aggression. It asserts:

> Formosa is not at present juridically Chinese territory. It is Chinese-occupied Japanese territory . . . and so it remains until it is formally retroceded to China by a peace treaty. (July 8, 1950.)

Even *The Economist,* however, dare not argue that Formosa is American territory, nor can it attempt to pretend that the legal position on June 27, from any point of view, was different from the legal position on January 5. What was recognised to be an aggressive act by President Truman himself in January remained an aggressive act when perpetrated by him in June.

Yet, in fact, every argument of ethnology, history, and international law affirms that Formosa is Chinese and Chinese alone. The Cairo Declaration of December 1, 1943, in the name of the United States, Britain and China stated their purpose:

> . . . All the territories that Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed.

That is categorical. There are no legal quibbles there, no reference to a peace treaty, and not the shadow of an excuse for President Truman to try to steal Formosa, like Japan of old, ' by violence and greed '.

The Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945, is, if anything, even more definite:

> The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku and such minor islands as we shall determine.

Those were the surrender terms to Japan, not peace terms. They were accepted by the Japanese Government when it capitulated and endorsed by all the United Nations. They were fulfilled, *de facto* and *de jure,* when Formosa was handed back to China in 1945. No one, not even *The Economist,* argued then about ' Chinese-occupied Japanese territory '.

The Chinese reply to America's attempt at annexation is also absolutely clear. Mao Tse-tung, Chairman of the Central People's Government Council of the Chinese People's Republic, addressing the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Conference (China's Interim Parliament), said in reply to Truman:

> The Chinese people have already affirmed that the affairs of the various countries throughout the world should be run by the peoples of the respective countries, and the affairs of Asia should be run by the peoples of Asia

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves and not by the United States. United States aggression in Asia only arouses the extensive and resolute resistance of the peoples of Asia.

Truman stated on January 5 this year that America would refrain from interfering in Taiwan (Formosa). Now he himself proves that his statement was all lies. . . The open exposure by the United States of its true face of imperialism is beneficial to the people of China and the peoples of Asia. . .

People throughout China and the world! Unite and prepare adequately to crush any provocation of American imperialism.

Chu En-lai, Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of China, on July 6 cabled to Trygve Lie, Secretary General of the United Nations, after declaring the Security Council's resolution on Korea illegal and saying:

. . . the statement by the United States President, Truman, on June 27, of the beginning of armed intervention against Taiwan's liberation by the People's Republic of China, together with the action by the United States navy in invading Chinese territorial waters around Taiwan, constitutes an act of open aggression which thoroughly violates the principles of the United Nations Charter forbidding any member to use force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any other State. . . By keeping silent on this act of open aggression of the United States Government, the Security Council and the Secretary General of the United Nations have abandoned their functions and duties of upholding world peace, and thereby become pliant instruments of the policy of the United States Government.

Now, in the name of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China I declare: Despite any military steps of obstruction taken by the United States Government, the Chinese people are irrevocably determined to liberate Taiwan without fail.

These statements leave no doubt as to what will be the consequences of American aggression against China, unless President Truman speedily goes back to his policy of January 5. The provocation against China, which that of Syngman Rhee in Korea designed to cover (see the *New York Times* of June 19, a few days before Rhee attacked), is equally menacing to world peace, especially as it is accompanied by, and cannot but be accompanied by, the perpetual further provocations by Chiang Kai-shek. Already on July 7 Chiang Kai-shek was declaring that his American 'planes would soon resume, behind the shield of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, their attacks on the Chinese mainland. What Syngman Rhee did, and what Chiang has done in the past, Chiang will do again. It is well known that for the last year Chiang Kai-shek, like his ally Syngman Rhee, has based his whole policy on precipitating a third world war. His policy today, protected by the U.S. Seventh Fleet, is exactly the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same as it was when he fled to Formosa. The only difference is that, with MacArthur's help, he has now secured the first of his objectives. He will proceed—unless the American policy in Formosa is reversed —again with the help of MacArthur and the war party in the United States, to his second, which is to stage even greater provocations against China.

And what is Britain's position? Is the British Government, which has already recognised the Chinese People's Republic and knows the friendly trade approaches which it has made to Britain, to be dragged into war with China behind the criminal frenzy of Chiang Kai-shek and MacArthur? Already British naval forces have been placed, according to Mr. Attlee's statement, 'at the disposal of the U.S. authorities'. And the American commander of the naval forces engaged in the Korean war, Vice-Admiral Struble, is at the same time commander of the American Seventh Fleet which has been ordered to Formosa. The peril in which Mr. Attlee has placed Britain is very clear indeed.

General MacArthur has endeavoured to make Japan the exclusive economic preserve of the American big monopolies. He has built an alliance of American and Japanese monopolies, dominated by the former, which, using Japanese sweated labour, is now driving British and Indian goods out of the whole of Japan's 'co-prosperity sphere' in south and south-east Asia. These acts should long ago have ended all illusions about any 'pro-British' aspects of America's eastern policy. It is of a piece with the attack of General MacArthur's Headquarters on the correspondent of *The Times* in Japan. It is of a piece with Chiang Kai-shek's attacks on British shipping; attacks which have led to the wounding and imprisonment of British officers, the killing of passengers on British boats, and the seizure of British ships for use as troop carriers.

The danger in which our country and our people stand is very great. But the solution is mercifully obvious. It is to withdraw British forces from Korea before they get entangled with Chiang's provocations of China: to demand and insist with ever growing vehemence that American intervention in China as well as Korea, be ended, and that China be given her rightful place in the United Nations so that a peaceful solution of the Korean conflict be found.

Only so can peace be saved.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BOMB-MONGERS

IVOR MONTAGU

If you are against the atomic bomb, you CANNOT oppose the Peace Petition.

It's as simple as that. True, there are some muddleheads who would dither about anything. And some who have got themselves into such a frenzy they would cut the hosepipe of a fire brigade playing on a burning building if the fireman were a Communist. But it goes for the sane, the cold, the calculating and those who know what they are doing. The masks are coming off the faces of the would-be murderers.

What are the terms of the issue, as set out in the Peace Petition and the Stockholm Appeal? Ban the bomb. Strictly control the banning of the bomb. Declare that government a war criminal that first henceforth employs the bomb against whatever country.

Who is for these three propositions? So far, by signature, 250 millions in 60 countries. A lot of people. (By the time this is printed it'll be a lot more).

Who is against? Well, Tito, who has forbidden the appeal within his dominions; MacArthur, Liaquat Ali Khan and various other characters, who arrest signatories; Morgan Phillips and Tewson, who expel them; all sorts of newspaper proprietors, to judge from their abuse; Truman and Acheson, they say so themselves.

Why?

Before we set out to answer this question, let us look at the history of the bomb and the discussions about banning it. Bare facts and no embroidery.

The bomb was first used in anger in summer, 1945. Its preparation and manufacture, despite the obligations of partnership and alliance publicly assumed by Churchill, were kept secret from U.S.S.R. Shortly thereafter a conference of Truman, Attlee and Mackenzie King announced the intention to 'share the secret' with the world, subject to introduction of a control system to their satisfaction.

Since then, it appears to be common ground that the 'secret' no longer exists. (A whole mythology, erected upon the person of a character named Fuchs and believed in by nobody outside Alice in Wonderland, has been invented in relation to this subject, but is irrelevant). More than one country can make, has made, presum-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ably is making, and could employ atom bombs, and America at least is trying to make worse.

Conversations for their control and abolition have resulted in deadlock. Two schemes hold the field. One, the Baruch plan, supported by U.S.A. and Great Britain, endorsed by a majority in the Security Council, but not by U.S.S.R., provides for international *ownership* and control of all sources, operations and utilisation of atomic materials and atomic energy, banning of bombs and destruction of existing U.S. stocks, *not* at any date to be internationally decided even by the control committee on which a U.S. majority is certain, *not* on any specified date at all, *but only* at an *unspecified* time, when the U.S. *unilaterally* decides the time is ripe. The other, proposed by U.S.S.R., opposed by U.S.A., Great Britain and the majority in the Security Council, provides for simultaneous *banning* of the bomb, *destruction* of stocks, and institution of a control system to be operated by an international committee with rights of inspection everywhere, both at regular periods and irregularly, whenever the majority—with no veto operating—may decide.

Opponents of the Baruch plan rudely declare that it is designed to give what must inevitably prove, under present circumstances, a U.S.-subservient authority control over what will be an increasingly vital factor in the power-economy of states, thus increasingly destroy their sovereignty and subject their economy and social structure to the U.S.-subservient authority *without any* guarantee of abolition of the bomb. Opponents of the Soviet plan have hitherto declared: that they are as anxious to abolish the bomb as anyone, that the Baruch plan provides the only secure method of control, and that the Soviet plan is phoney for it is insufficiently detailed.

Note carefully this last sentence, for it is the position publicly maintained, at least until recently, by the U.S. and British Governments, a position rapidly becoming as untenable as the famous 'last lines' of MacArthur in Southern Korea.

If one *sincerely* maintains this position, surely the logical course is not deadlock, but to investigate the phoniness or authenticity of the Soviet plan, let the experts explore and work out details. Indeed, this thought *has* occurred to such unusual Reds as *The Times,* the *Manchester Guardian* and both the Archbishops.

Similarly, *if* one sincerely maintains this position, *how* is it possible to oppose the Stockholm Appeal? *If* you *really* don't want the bomb to be used, how is it possible to oppose designation of the first use of it henceforth as a war crime? This may not *prevent* its use, it cannot do other than *deter* its use. *If* you *really* want the bomb

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be abolished, and the carrying out of the abolition strictly internationally controlled, how is it possible to oppose that demand of the petition? The wording doesn't say 'the Soviet proposals for control are adequate, accept them', it says 'strict control', just that, and if your *honest* objection to the Soviet proposals is fear that they will not, when it comes to brass tacks, agree to a strict enough system, then millions of signatures can only help you, because the weight of the world opinion they represent will make it more, not less, difficult for anyone to evade a strict system, on any frivolous pretext, once negotiations are resumed.

In the light of these reflections, examine the attitude of these Baruch-supporting gentry to the Stockholm Appeal. Never, never, under any considerations or anywhere do they give it support. They fear it as—is it fair to say?—a certain person fears holy water. Instead of regarding it as an aid, as a great movement of popular opinion, *the* greatest in history, in support of that which, outwardly, they are supposed to favour, and pressure against anyone who dishonestly obstructs, they fight it with all their might.

First they sought to overcome their dilemma by silence.

Thus Priestley pretended to be partially blind. Able to invent reasons for rejecting the challenge of Ehrenburg, Aldridge, Montagu to join the peace movement, he yet could not decipher the sentences asking: sign or say why! Thus Morgan Phillips could denounce at length the entire world movement as a Kremlin tool, yet without daring to mention the anti-bomb campaign on which the movement's whole effort is concentrated. Thus 42 newspapers and agencies could attend the press conference of the World Bureau meeting in London that announced the first 100 millions and yet all but one British national newspaper did not find a word to say about it (the exception was *The Times*, one paragraph)*

100 million signatures in the world, 200,000 in Britain, silence did not serve.

Next they tried the tactic: 'Yah, Red!'

But there is one fatal weakness about this peculiar appeal to reason, that is, that it is hardly reasonable.

The weakness is not, of course, that it is untrue. McCarthy has learnt that. What matter if such as Bonomi, de Nicola, Nitti, Orlando, the entire Finnish Cabinet, Thomas Mann, Pierre Benoit, Maurice Chevalier, Duke Ellington, who you like, signs the petition? If a signatory is not a Red, that *ipso facto* proves he is a 'stooge'.

The weakness is: that it does not seem reasonable to ordinary

*and the *Daily Worker*, of course.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blokes not to do a thing worth doing, just because Communists do it too.

Just study the wriggles, on this question, of the Cardinals and entire bench of bishops of France! Christians are perpetually being insulted nowadays, they say, by having thrust in front of them one or another piece of paper asking if they are against the atom bomb. But of course Christians cannot possibly be other than against such a monstrous weapon of slaughter of innocents and destruction of cities. That goes without saying. Only wicked Communists would think of asking. . . All right. But *if* Christians are so certainly against the bomb, how can they possibly regard it as wrong to mobilise world opinion against the bomb, or refrain from lending the job a hand? There's the rub! There's the dilemma. Not surprising that Cardinal Sapieha, the Trieste archbishop, bishops galore in Poland and Italy and bunches of French clergy have joined their signatures to the Abbé Boulier's this time! And why doesn't Mr. Truman take time off from White House prayers to sign also?

Ordinary people, simple people, hoping and praying for the safety of their children, are apt to ask: if it's really true that the Communists are backing this petition, maybe they're not so bad after all—and what are you backing?

200 millions in the world, 800,000 in Britain, red-baiting does not serve.

So now, cats out of bags, the third stage, truth at last. Support to the petition is treason. It is a plot to ' help Russia '. *We* cannot afford to abolish the bomb, *even if* both sides abolish it, even if (or still more if) the abolition is effectively controlled. WE WANT THE BOMB.

Mr. Acheson says: it is aggression that matters, not what weapon you use. We all know now what aggression is, according to Mr. Acheson. It is whatever you like to ask a hand-picked jury, all owing you money and hoping to borrow more, ignoring the laws and refusing to hear the accused, to call aggression. And then afterward it is no worse to use atom bombs than bows and arrows. Thank you, Mr. Acheson, for this self-revelation.

And Mr. Truman says: I used it before to save life and would use it again. (This same Mr. Truman would tell you that the reason Communists are beyond the pale is that, unlike Christians, they believe in doing evil that good may come, that the end can justify the means). Now, everyone who has worked out the dates knows, and everyone who is honest admits, that this is just not true. There was not, could not be, any military urgency for using the atomic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bomb those times in Japan when Mr. Truman used it. But, whether or no, what becomes of the pretence that the Baruch plan is a real project to end the bomb, and not just a pretext to avoid a project? Why should Mr. Truman assent to abolish an instrument that may save life? Thank you, Mr. Truman.

The point is—their entire world-policy, world-outlook, world-strategy is founded on the bomb. They would not dare to bully whole populations, and tell them what sort of governments they might and might not have, without the bomb. They would not dare to seize and hold military bases in every quarter of the globe, without the bomb. They could not refuse to agree and compromise, without the bomb.

It is not a question of winning with the bomb. The bomb cannot win wars, it can only crush, torture and destroy. The rout of Syngman Rhee and MacArthur in Korea is only the last of a series of proofs that what is decisive, in the end of ends, is the will of the people, the human spirit. *The bomb is blackmail.* They pretend to believe those who oppose them monsters. Really, they rely on the nobility of their opponents. They say, grant us our way, or we shall massacre the innocents. That is why *they* need the bomb. That is why they oppose the Stockholm Appeal. There can be no other reason.

Masks are off. And the faces that they hid are ugly.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FIRST THIRTY YEARS

R. PAGE ARNOT

THE Communist Party was born amid a great anti-war movement, when the working class, organised in Councils of Action, and supported by the mass of the British people, stopped an aggressive war of Anglo-French imperialism. Then, as now, the millionaires' newspapers were howling for war; then, as now, Winston Churchill figured as a leading warmonger. In the mighty upsurge of the working class by which the plans of the warmongers were thwarted, the elements that came together in the Communist Party played an outstanding part. The first task, the first duty, of the newly-formed Communist Party was to help to keep up the pressure that could prevent war and bring about peace: and in all the years that followed, up till today, the Communist Party has maintained its struggle for peace and against unjust wars. It is the party that fights for a lasting peace.

The struggle had begun earlier. When this century opened, in Britain, as elsewhere in Europe, there were already two clearly marked tendencies in the working class movement. On the one hand there were the militant Socialists who in most countries had rallied on a basis of Marxism and on the other the Reformists (or Revisionists or Opportunists) who made up the Right Wing. In the years between 1910 and 1914, as conditions worsened, and the bankruptcy of the Right Wing policy of support to Liberal capitalism became clearer, the Left Wing began to gain ground among the advanced sections of the working class. All the more when this happened the bourgeoisie gave their powerful support to the Opportunist tendency which was thus enabled to carry through the great betrayal of socialism in the imperialist war of 1914-18.

The policy of socialists towards imperialist war was clear and had been repeatedly laid down at international Socialist Congresses. That policy was to prevent war, and if, despite them, war broke out, to oppose their governments and to use the crisis arising from the war to bring about the downfall of capitalist class rule. The Labour Party had subscribed to this, along with the Social-Democratic parties of Europe. The Right Wing leaders and sections were also pledged to carry this out. When the imperialist war broke out in August, 1914, they forsook their pledges, supported the capitalist government and hounded the workers into the slaughter-house. Thus

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the opportunist Right Wing was revealed as tied to the capitalists and traitors to socialism.

The struggle against imperialist war and for the overthrow of capitalist class rule was continued by the minorities of the Left Wing, who alone remained true to socialism. In one country only, in the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, the majority (the Bolsheviks, as they were called) had remained true to socialism, and used the crisis of the imperialist war to bring about the downfall of capitalism. Thus when the trumpets of the Russian Revolution rang out all over the world, they found a ready response among the masses of workers who, sickened of the slaughter, were breaking away from the influence of the bourgeoisie and the Opportunists of the Right Wing and moving towards a united struggle of the whole working class. A great upsurge of workers took place all over the world, in every country and continent. Out of these circumstances and amid a vast united anti-war movement the Communist Party was born, itself gathering into one party all the various organisations and workshop movements that stood for working class unity. Thus, in its beginnings the Communist Party stood for the unity of the working class in struggle—and for this it has stood throughout the 30 years since 1920. In all these years the Communist Party has had to carry on a stubborn fight for unity of the working class and against capitalism, which seeks and must ever seek to destroy that unity. For the purposes of the capitalists, the Right Wing leaders serve as their best agency to destroy unity.

What a resultant drama of struggle has unfolded during these past 30 years! How few believed in 1910, 40 years ago, that within a decade Britain and the whole world would have been plunged into an epoch of wars and revolutions? Yet these 30 years have seen the frenzied efforts of the imperialist powers (while at variance with each other) to maintain their domination over the working class at home, to hold down the colonial peoples whom they exploit, to hinder and destroy the building of socialism. Inter-imperialist rivalries lead to war. Thirty years ago—and again today—imperialism wages war on colonial peoples struggling for liberation. Thirty years ago—and again today—imperialism seeks to destroy the Soviet Union, the land of socialism and all the Peoples' Democracies that move towards socialism.

What has been the record of the Communist Party in these 30 years in its struggle for working class unity to defeat the attacks of the capitalists and to maintain peace? That record is part of the annals of the British working class in its struggle, and cannot be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

separated from it. Out of what the millions of this country have gone through in the last 30 years, let us take only a few outstanding examples.

Between 1920 and 1940 there was continuous mass unemployment in this country of a kind never known before. Each year there were a million or more out of work, rising at its peak in 1932 to three-and-a-half millions. The high point of the statistical curve was for these millions a depth, an abyss of poverty, under-feeding and misery. For the capitalists it was an opportunity to split and weaken the working class, to play off one man against another, to enforce docile obedience in the workshop, to lower wages, to worsen conditions. The Right Wing leadership could do nothing—they even met in successive special conferences in 1921 in order to decide to do nothing. Then it was as a means to the unity of the whole movement to deal with this burning question that an unexampled step was taken. The unemployed were brought to organise themselves. Under the leadership of well-known Communists there was built up on a national scale the Unemployed Workers' Movement, which rebuilt this feeling of unity of all workers, employed or unemployed, and forced concessions from the hard-faced capitalists and their governments. And when, in 1931, the hated Means Test was imposed (after it had been approved 'in principle' by the Right Wing leaders—a fact usually covered up) it was the persistent and fearless agitation of the Communist Party which brought the great popular demonstrations that compelled the alteration of scales of relief.

When the vast capitalist offensive began in 1921 with the lockout of the miners followed in 1922 by the lockout of the engineers, when Right Wing leaders like Ernest Bevin were yielding to cuts without any resistance through industrial struggles, it was the Communists who took a foremost part in the resistance. It inspired the Minority Movement which for six years after 1923 built up new life within the unions and unity in struggle for better wages. When the capitalist offensive was renewed in 1925, and when the Right-winger J. H. Thomas (the Secretary of the Railwaymen who had played a traitor's part in 1921 against the miners) was once more devising means to keep the workers divided, it was the Communist Party which strove for a united resistance to the capitalists and the Baldwin-Churchill Cabinet.

After Red Friday—the signal success won by a united working class—the Communists strove to preserve and develop that unity. The Baldwin-Churchill Cabinet knew the Communists to be the implacable enemies of capitalism and tried to stifle their activity by a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

state trial of 12 leading members of the Party—with the result that workers in thousands joined the Communist Party and prepared for united action in the General Strike. When the General Strike, that climax of working class solidarity in Britain, was betrayed by J. H. Thomas and his cronies who suddenly gave in an unconditional surrender, thus letting loose the vengeance of the employers on their workmen, it was the Communist Party which gave out the slogans which rallied the workers, whose firm stand sobered up the frenzy of the capitalists. Then when the epic seven months' struggle of the miners saved the whole working class from the worst consequences of the Right Wing betrayal, the Baldwin Government enforced the Emergency Powers Act and under it arrested some eight thousand workers of whom two thousand were Communists—a proof, if any were wanted, of how well the Communists fought in that united struggle. They alone stood by the miners to the end.

The defence of the U.S.S.R., of the first Workers' Republic, of the land of socialism has always been the acid test of class unity and class loyalty in Britain. A united working class in 1920 thwarted the efforts of Churchill and other capitalists to crush the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. Baffled in 1920, British Imperialism, and all the other capitalist powers, tried again and again, by every possible means to injure the land of socialism. Forged documents and forged newspapers, large scale wrecking, assassination of leading Bolsheviks—no method was too dirty for imperialism to use. Above all, campaigns were launched in the newspapers vilifying and slandering the Soviet workers and peasants. But wherever the workers were united in struggle, they recognised that the same sort of abuse and slander was hurled at themselves and hence knew that the interests of workers were the same the world over, whether here or in Soviet Russia, and that they should therefore defend that most advanced Soviet working class. The Soviet people had incurred the hatred and vilification of the capitalist press, and all the other propaganda agencies of capitalism, for the simple reason that capitalism has been destroyed in the U.S.S.R.: and their example might be followed in other countries. These arguments were able to withstand the poison-propaganda of hatred for many a year: and the Communists were to the forefront in this, living antidotes to the capitalist poison. Hitler, however, reached a new climax in anti-Soviet slanders: and Hitler's example, followed in the last five years by concentrated venom from every bourgeois agency, including above all the Right Wing leadership, has deceived a number of people, including workers, and made them forget how their fathers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always stood by the U.S.S.R. or how much they themselves owed to the Soviet armies and peoples in the last four years of the war. Hence more than ever the acid test of all true fighters for their class is the attitude to the U.S.S.R. Here the Communists have stood the test.

The right of peoples to decide upon their own destiny was the teaching of Marx and Engels, was the policy of international socialism laid down at the International Socialist Congress in London in 1896 and repeated in the early part of this century at the Stuttgart Congress of 1907 where only a small minority agreed with Ramsay MacDonald in his plea that capitalism could have a 'civilising mission' among peoples such as those of Asia and Africa. Thirty years ago the British Government (with Churchill a member of it) was responsible for the atrocities of the Black-and-Tans in Ireland, whose liberation was demanded by the whole working class of Britain. The British Government was holding down Egypt and India by force, and its servants were machine-gunning peaceful demonstrations as in the massacre at Amritsar. Again, the whole of the working class stood for the independence of Egypt and of India. But when the Right Wing leadership, with the support and permission of the Liberal capitalists, formed Labour Governments in 1924 and in 1929, the lip-service they had once paid to the tenets of socialism were straightway replaced by actual service to the interests of imperialism. All their talk was seen to be hollow. The Communist Party stood firmly by the broad interest of the British working class in the freedom of other peoples. Fighting for the right of nations to decide their own destiny and knowing that a people that oppresses others can never itself be free, Communists went to help the workers of India in their struggle to build trade unions. Together with their Indian comrades they were arrested and thrown into prison at Meerut by the Baldwin-Churchill Government. The Right Wing leadership, posturing as a Labour Government in 1929, kept the Meerut prisoners in jail and in defiance of hundreds of resolutions of protest from the trade unions of Britain, let the long trial of the Meerut prisoners drag on until it ended in savage sentences, while at the same time, they threw Gandhi, Nehru and other leaders of the Indian National Congress into prison. By the time the Right Wing leadership had reached its third administration, they proclaimed the permanence of the partition of Ireland and then went a step further than the Tories by bringing about the partition of India which could no longer be held as a dependency in the old way.

The Communist Party, in tune with the united struggle of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

working class for the right of every people to decide upon its destiny, stands for ending the partition of Ireland and for the liberation of the peoples of India from the subtle scheme of bondage to monopoly imperialism that is hidden under their nominal independence. The Communist Party fights for the withdrawal of British troops from Malaya, where a Creech-Jones and a Strachey have gone one better than the Churchill of 1920 by substituting Dyak head-hunters for Black-and-Tans as their auxiliary troops.

From 1933 onwards when Hitler seized power in Germany, there came the double danger of fascism and war. While the Right Wing leadership, headed by Ernest Bevin at that time, was asking the Labour Movement to agree with the policy of the Baldwin Government in September, 1935, to deal with Mussolini's attack on Ethiopia, the Communist Party was denouncing Baldwin as a trickster and exposing the hypocrisy of 'Slippery Sam' Hoare—which trickery was exposed by the Hoare-Laval agreement a couple of months later. This meant that Hoare was hurled from office when the mass of the people found that the Communist Party had correctly analysed the situation, but in the meantime, Baldwin had taken advantage of the favourable attitude to Toryism of the Right Wing leadership to win the General Election of autumn, 1935. It was by lying and deceit that Baldwin won that election, as he brazenly confessed a year later; but he was helped by his willing dupes among the Right Wing leaders who broke up the broad unity that had been built up against fascism and war and had extended to all sections of the people.

When the butcher Franco, with the backing of Hitler and Mussolini, began his fascist rebellion against the democratically elected government of the Spanish Republic, the whole working class were roused; their hearts responded when they heard Stalin's message that the struggle in Spain was not 'a private affair of the Spaniards but the common cause of all advanced and progressive mankind'. But their will to help the Spaniards was thwarted by the Right Wing leadership who felt they too must connive at the British Government's conniving at the Non-Intervention farce by which the rightful government of Spain was denied the arms which Hitler and Mussolini were sending to Butcher Franco. It was at this point that the Communist Party saved the honour of the British working class when it organised the International Brigade in which some of the best sons of the British people gave their lives in the effort to save Europe from fascism and war. The example given by the Party so corresponded to the inmost feelings of the working class as a whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that within a year they compelled the Right Wing leadership to break off its collaboration with Neville Chamberlain in his design of giving a free hand to the Nazis and the Italian Fascists in Spain against its democratically elected government. It had been thought earlier that when Ramsay MacDonald, having for years betrayed the interests of the workers, at length in 1931 openly crossed over to the camp of Toryism with his fellow-traitors Snowden and J. H. Thomas, a lesson had been learned. Maybe, but not by the Right Wing leadership. MacDonald departed, but as may be seen from this unsavoury coalition of policy over Spain, MacDonaldism remained. There is no such thing as Bevinism today; it is only MacDonaldism carried out by Ernest Bevin—and even taken a step further. The final test in the fight against fascism and war was the disgraceful episode of Munich, when Neville Chamberlain in a House of Commons that was stricken with mass hysteria, received the plaudits of the Right Wing leadership, with the solitary Communist M.P. alone raising his voice against the selling out of Czechoslovakia to fascism. There the Communist Party spoke for the whole working class, for the people of Britain, while the Right Wing leaders were kow-towing to Chamberlain, and through him, to Hitler.

When, despite the efforts of the Communist Party to build unity of the working class against fascism and war and for the alliance that would maintain peace, the treacherous policy of Chamberlain eventually resulted in war, that war was mainly directed against the working class. This was the period of ' the phoney war ', when Chamberlain was dropping leaflets on Germany and making full preparations for dropping bombs on the Soviet Union against whom it was hoped to switch the war. The Communist Party exposed this 'phoney war ', and laid bare the purposes of the British ruling class. When as the war developed, it became fully a war of the peoples against fascism, the Communist Party in common with the working class as a whole demanded the Second Front that would have shortened the war, brought a speedier victory and thereby have saved untold lives. The workers were able to drive a Moore-Brabazon from office, but, because the Right Wing leadership sat there ensconced in Churchill's War Cabinet, the will of the masses voiced by the Communist Party could not be carried out. It is now publicly admitted that Churchill's policy, backed by the Right Wing leadership, was to delay the Second Front, not for military but for political reasons. Not only for the Second Front that would have brought a speedier victory but for all the tasks the soldiers had to face, the Communist Party was foremost in the workshops and the mines, in the unions and the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

other working class organisations in straining every nerve to bring about victory over fascism, a people's victory, a victory that would lead to lasting peace.

Today, when there is the grave danger that British boys may be sent to fight on behalf of Yankee imperialism in a disgraceful war of aggression on the Korean people, the Communist Party fights against this disgrace and calls for the united struggle of the working class against the factual war coalition of Churchill and the Right Wing leadership, a struggle against imperialism, a struggle for people's democracy and for a lasting peace.

FASCIST SOUTH AFRICA

SAM KAHN

(Speech delivered in the House of Assembly on June 15, 1950)

The Suppression of Communism Bill, introduced by a Government among whose members were notorious supporters of the Nazis and which represents at most ten per cent. of a total population of eleven millions, has been followed by almost complete silence of the Liberal and Labour press on this matter. We are pleased to print some important passages from this speech by South Africa's only Communist M.P.—Ed., L.M.

I WISH to deal with the hon. the Minister of Justice's speech on this Bill. He has admitted to this House that his Bill is one of revolutionary character, that it makes drastic inroads into our traditional system. It violates the normal protections of law which are allowed an individual, in that it clothes him with extraordinary, unfettered and unchallengeable powers of absolute censorship of books and newspapers, to suppress political parties at his whim, to blacklist and banish individuals—men and women—from their homes, to remove judges from the Bench, to isolate witnesses and suspects and to remove them from the protection of their lawyers and their counsel. In short, to punish men arbitrarily without trial.

The Minister has regaled the House with some lurid, spine-chilling, blood-curdling, hair-raising stories of Communism, of the vast crime which has been planned by the Communist Party in particular to sabotage our power stations, and among other cruel and wicked things, to poison the reservoirs and the water supplies of this country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Minister must forgive me if I recall at this moment the Reichstag fire trial, when Goering, having used the half-witted Van der Lubbe to set fire to the Parliament of Germany, the Parliament of the Reich, was exposed later as having himself ordered the destruction of the German Parliament by fire. Of this arson he accused the Communists. The Minister says the Communists planned to poison water—Goering used fire, the Minister uses water—and I say to the Minister that is a complete and monstrous fabrication, it is a false and vile accusation against the Communist Party, that they have planned any such plot whatsoever. And if the Minister—who has not sucked the story out of his thumb—has been informed to this effect by his police officials, then it is proof that either lunacy is rampant in the police force, or this is another example of police corruption and a conspiracy for the preparation of a frame-up of the Communist Party of South Africa by the Minister. . .

Mr. Speaker, the other aspect of the attacks by the Minister on the Communist Party was that the Communist Party is an incitement in itself, that the Communist Party seizes upon the real and particularly upon the imaginary grievances of the people of this country, exploits them and puts them up against the Government and against the white people as a whole. And I will give this House clear proof, not from my lips but from a source the integrity and independence of which the Minister dare attack at his peril, and I say that that is a vile untruth. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Minister of Justice, exercising as he will do under this Bill an existing power under the Riotous Assemblies Act, banned a pamphlet issued by the Communist Party known as the 'Malanazi Menace'. That pamphlet was an attack upon this Government and its policy. It related when the Government came into power how they freed the fascists—

The Minister of Justice: This is sub judice.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! This matter is sub judice at the moment.

Mr. Kahn: It is no longer sub judice. Judgment was given this morning. The Communist Party pamphlet recited the catalogue of deeds of this Government, the freeing of the traitors, the Hitlerites during the war who had been tried and imprisoned for treason, it referred to their racial attacks upon the Non-European people, their oppressive policy of *apartheid,* and it stigmatised the Prime Minister and the members of this Government as being Hitlerite. The Minister brought his powers under the Riotous Assemblies Act into effect and he declared that the document was an unlawful incitement of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Non-Europeans against the Europeans. . . But because of a fortunate safeguard in that section of the Riotous Assemblies Act, that the Minister's decision to ban a document can be appealed against in the Supreme Court, the Supreme Court of the Transvaal today, through Mr. Justice de Villiers, upset and overrode the Minister's ban and ruled that the Communist Party had exercised its democratic right of free criticism of the Government and its policy, that there was no incitement of the Non-Europeans—

The Minister of Economic Affairs: That shows the need for these powers.

Mr. Kahn: It shows that you intend to tamper with the judiciary.

(*Here there were a number of interruptions lasting for a few minutes, the United Party calling to the Nationalists*: '*Yes, what are you going to do to our judges?*' and '*Now you've let the cat out of the bag*'.)

The other criticism of the Communist Party which has been made by the Minister—and that is a legitimate criticism—is that he does not like our programme. We do stand for absolute racial equality and peace in South Africa; we do stand for a system of socialism, so that the resources of the land can be devoted to the needs of those who help to produce the wealth of South Africa. The Minister of Justice must indicate this to the House. Is anybody who opposes the policy of *apartheid* of this Government going to be deemed a Communist by the Minister in the future?

Mr. Speaker, let us test this Bill. The Minister of Justice, in his second-reading speech, has declared that the Springbok Legion* is a Communist organisation. Let us suppose that it is. In terms of this Bill, the Minister will appoint his liquidator, his gestapo officer, who will draw up a list of all the members of the Springbok Legion; and under this Bill every person who is a member of the Springbok Legion, or was in fact a supporter of the Springbok Legion, can be named Communist under Section 1 (iii). The Minister can take such people and if they are employees in the Public Service, he can dismiss them; if judges, he can remove them from the Bench; and if they are members of Parliament he can expel them from Parliament and entrench the slender majority of the Government. And all with no right of recourse to the courts. . . All the ex-servicemen of this country, all the trade unions of this country, all the democratic institutions can be condemned without any hearing. The churches can be condemned in South Africa for propagating Communism if

*The South African Ex-Servicemen's organisation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they oppose and attack the Government's policy of *apartheid* and demand Christian equality and brotherly love for all South African citizens. . .

The history of the peoples' struggle for freedom throughout the centuries has demonstrated one great truth: You cannot imprison ideas. You cannot impale people's opinions on bayonets; you cannot crush thoughts with knobkerries; you cannot concentrate views behind barbed wire; and no amount of suppression, no amount of brutal force to hinder people in the expression of their political views, and the attainment of their aspirations, will ever succeed.

Who, then, is safe in South Africa, when the power to determine whether a man is a Communist or not is in the hands of an enemy of freedom and democracy, who has sworn and pledged himself not only in his political programme, but by secret oaths which he has taken behind closed doors to usher into South Africa a fascist republic, which would obliterate such rights and liberties as we enjoy today? No man before or during an election will dare criticise a government having this power for fear he will be called a Communist under this Bill. Absolute, infinite and unchallengeable powers are given to this Minister to name anybody a Communist, any political opponents, even within his own ranks—

An Hon. Member: You have said that before.

Mr. Kahn: If I have said it before, it requires repetition, for this Bill may be your epitaph one day.

An Hon. Member: It is yours.

Mr. Kahn: Mr. Speaker, I am told by the hon. member there that this is my last speech. This is not my last speech. My words will be imperishable. They will be remembered in South Africa.

Millions of Communists have been suppressed, have been tortured and killed through the long march of history. But remember that today Communism is the social doctrine and political philosophy under which 850,000,000 people are living, covering one-third of the earth's surface.

An Hon. Member: What are you hoping for?

Mr. Kahn: I am hoping for nothing except the end of this Government, and that will be the combined task of the South African people, composed as it is of white, black, English, Afrikaner, Indian, Malay, Coloured, African, Christian and non-believer—all these will be forced together into indissoluble unity by this Government, because of the common suffering they will experience. This Bill, Mr. Speaker, is concentrating the attention of South Africa up-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the 'menace' of Communism as a diversion to deflect the minds of the people from the real danger which there exists for the people and democracy of South Africa. That is the danger of the tyrant and the despot, the racialists who rule South Africa at the present moment.

Book Review

ATOMIC ENERGY — USE OR MISUSE

Atomic Energy. Edited by J. L. Crammer and R. E. Peierls, F.R.S. (200 pp. Penguin Books, 1*s*. 6*d*.)

Atomic Attack—Can Britain be defended? Published by the Association of Scientific Workers. (22 pp. 1*s*.)

SOME years ago Penguin Books devoted an issue of *Science News* to the subject of atomic energy and its applications. Although written in a semi-popular style, each article was the work of an acknowledged authority in his field. The edition was quickly sold out. In the work on 'Atomic Energy' reviewed here the articles of the previous work have been brought up to date. There are also, however, four new articles which in themselves constitute a notable addition to the literature presenting the basic facts about atomic energy to an educated, but not specialist, public.

In one of the new articles Sir John Cockcroft, F.R.S., discusses the kind of technical problems that have to be solved in the design of nuclear reactors for purposes of power production. He points out that if and when these problems can be solved it will require about 600 tons a year of uranium to provide for the total electrical needs of Great Britain and about twice this to provide a thermal energy equal to our present total thermal needs. The overall costs per unit of electrical energy would not be markedly different from the corresponding costs using conventional fuel. The big specific advantage of atomic fuel is, of course, the very small amount of it required to produce a very large amount of heat. Even the figure of 600 tons of fuel given above is based on the assumption that only 1 per cent. of the uranium will be used up in the process. Sir John's article is distinguished by a characteristic caution in assessing atomic power possibilities, but on the technical side the picture he draws is by no means pessimistic. Summing up the position, he writes, 'The development (of atomic power) depends on our experience, on availability of materials and on the world political situation'. The semi-technical nature of the book no doubt prevented him from developing this last point further. If he had done so he might have added that comparatively little effort is at present going into work directed towards the development of reactors for producing atomic power. Almost the entire uranium mined in the western world is being rushed to the United States as fast as ships can carry it. There it is being used, not for building atomic power stations, but for the manufacture of atomic bombs. If this is allowed to continue we shall not have any significant amounts of atomic power during our own lifetime or that of our children's children.

In other new articles in the present book Professor C. E. Tilley, F.R.S., discusses the distribution throughout the world of the natural ores of uranium and thorium which form the raw materials of atomic energy. W. J. Arrol and K. Fearnside give a fascinating account of the present-day uses of radioactive isotopes in biology and industry and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

show how even today these by-products of atomic piles are being put to useful employment in the laboratories, clinics, and industrial establishments of this country. And J. L. Crammer adds a short note on the precautions that have to be taken in handling radioactive materials if hazard to health is to be avoided.

The new articles reflect to a considerable extent the progress that has been made in the development of the Harwell Atomic Energy Establishment since the appearance of the first edition of this work. This progress is particularly evident in many of the excellent series of illustrations. The scientists and other workers at Harwell might well be proud of the rapid progress that has been made on the technical side there and it is good to see, in the large amount of fundamental work being carried out, that British nuclear physics is beginning to regain some of its old pre-eminence, temporarily lost to the Americans as a result of the war. One cannot forget, however, that in spite of the ideals of the great majority of the scientific workers there and their sincere wish that the work being carried out at Harwell should be devoted entirely to peaceful ends, it is inevitable that the experience gained in the design, construction and operation of atomic piles is, under present circumstances, above all of value for the solution of problems associated with the production of plutonium for atomic weapons. The full realisation of all the potentialities for peaceful and constructive uses of atomic energy depends on the abolition and outlawing of atomic weapons.

Some idea of what would be in store for this country if, unhappily, the present campaign for the abolition of atomic weapons should fail and if a third world war should break out, is provided by the pamphlet *Atomic Attack* issued by the Association of Scientific Workers. As Professor Blackett, F.R.S., says in a foreword, the pamphlet contains 'a sound and sober appraisal of the technical facts about the probable effects of atomic bombs. It includes also a careful assessment of the possibilities of interception of the aircraft carrying the bombs and of the possibility of passive defence through dispersal and A.R.P. measures'.

The analysis of the pamphlet shows how little is likely to be done to protect the people of this country against atomic attack in the event of war. Fairly effective defence could be provided but only by the provision of extensive bomb-proof shelters many hundreds of feet below the surface, the large-scale building of underground factories, or their dispersal to remote parts of the country far away from their natural environment. Even the provision of rescue services of the kind envisaged in the current Civil Defence programme presents a colossal, well-nigh insoluble problem. To deal with one atomic bomb alone on an average British city a trained rescue force of 200,000 would be required, of whom some 20,000 would need to be trained medical technicians (including doctors, nurses and others)—not to mention some 8,000 tons of vital medical supplies.

In view of these facts how can one but endorse the words of Professor Blackett in his foreword?

'I think the arguments presented make inescapable the conclusion that adequate defence of the United Kingdom against atomic attack launched from nearby bases on the Continent is quite impracticable, if only on economic grounds. The cost of the necessary passive defence measures, dispersal, underground factories, shelters, etc., is wildly outside the economic possibilities of this economically hard-pressed country. It is entirely safe to conclude that the measures will not, in fact, be taken'.

The pamphlet makes unmistakably clear that whoever won a full-scale atomic war, these islands would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be reduced to a level of misery and devastation the like of which the world has never seen. In the words of the pamphlet, 'The only way out of the impasse is to ensure that the third world war does not in fact take place. Such a war would have fatal results, perhaps most of all for Great Britain . . . Let us not forget that the "cold war" is not the only alternative. A much better and more positive approach would be to continue to seek for a *modus vivendi* between East and West, or, in other words, to return to the principles of foreign policy associated with the name of Franklin Roosevelt, who believed in and actively strove for the peaceful co-existence of different social systems'.

Appendices to the pamphlet contain a brief statement of the principles of operation of the proposed hydrogen bomb and the text of the proposals for ending the deadlock on International Control of Atomic Energy, put forward by the Association of Scientific Workers in December, 1949.

The pamphlet can be a most valuable weapon in the present struggle for peace—the outstanding issue of our time.

ATEMNOS.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

THE INEVITABLE STRUGGLE

ALL these things have but one conclusion. That conclusion is that we have *got to fight.* Our back is up against the wall. We have no choice. On this the Federation Conference was absolutely and completely of one mind. Nevertheless, though we miners are united on this, it is worth while to point out for the benefit of the readers of the *Labour Monthly* (amongst whom are included many colliers) what would be the effect of a retreat. A retreat would mean starvation wages now, *followed by yet* another cut six or nine months hence. And other workers will begin to feel the draught.

I remember well the great engineers' lockout of 1897. I remember that I left the pit I was working at, and I spent six weeks going up and down Yorkshire and roundabout, helping to organise the engineers that were locked out. I hadn't but three pounds ten of my own when I started: and after six weeks I was left with five shillings. So you may judge I had roughed it, sleeping where I could . . . Our next big experience was the movement of 1912 for the minimum wage: and we learned lots then of what part the Government would play in a dispute. But our bitterest experience was in 1921, when we were rebuffed by the Liberal and Tory Coalition under Lloyd George, who sold us for a mess of pottage.

Herbert Smith, President of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain, in *Strategy of the Miners' Struggle.* August, 1925.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

memories of the bumper issues of years ago, packed with ammunition. I feel I must respond'. Especially singled out was D. N. Pritt's 'fine article on India that ripped away the "Iron Curtain" which both Pandit Nehru and our Right-wing leaders are attempting to build round what they love to call "democratic India"'. Practically all refer to our efforts for peace. From Westcliff-on-Sea: 'I support your struggle for peace and socialism, for I believe this to be the basis for the elimination of war, and I wish you luck in your future endeavours'.

There is an echo of the long, long peace fight in one of the new fund contributions, a gift in memory of Communist Councillor Lewis Jones who died at the height of a whirlwind campaign to stop the war of intervention against the Spanish people by Hitler. This rehearsal by Hitler and Mussolini for World War II was connived at by those who now applaud intervention in Korea. I remember we used to explain at home that 'Bombs on Barcelona mean Bombs on Bristol'. That slogan is bitten deep into the grass-grown ruins of the West Country city. We failed to stop that war of intervention . . .

SCOTS WHA HAE!

This month 'A Socialist Airman' writes: 'Here's my shilling to keep Taunton off the dole queue, and all power to *Labour Monthly* in its great efforts to keep Britain off it too. Also another shilling to bring Inverness into the picture, so that some outraged Scot may rally to its side to save it from a mere Sassenach's patronage, and in doing so bring in more fighters for socialism'. Before feeling runs too high, I might say that my records show a higher proportion of steady money guarantees from Scotland than from England, Wales or Ireland (including, of course, the Six Counties). Which might go to show that the Scots have a keener sense of the value of *Labour Monthly*? One big donation makes the June fund look deceptively healthy at

£44 10s. 4d.

STAND-IN money came from:

D. Mayo, standing in for Plymouth and Rottingdean, 2s; 'Exeter', standing in for Birmingham, Crediton, Dublin, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Norwich, Swansea, Turton (Lancs.) and Weymouth, 8s; 'Bath', standing in for Aylesbury, Cardiff, Totnes, Watford and Warwick, 5s; 'Billie, standing in for Tonypandy, in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s; J.T., standing in for Chicago, 1s.

STEADY MONEY guarantees came from:

'A Socialist Airman for Taunton', 1s; 'Manchester Friends', 2s; D. Mayo, 10s; J. Tuckett, 1s 6d; 'Ruth for Philadelphia', 1s; 'Exeter', 2s; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; 'Leicester', 5s; R.J.R., 'Ipswich' 5s; C.B., 'Bristol', 1s 6d; 'Belfast' (prepaid); 'Ilfracombe' (prepaid); 'J.F. for Aberdeen', 12s; 'M.S. for New York', £1; 'Bath', 5s; E. D. McCallum, 5s; D. Rees, £1; S. Morrissy, £1; H.G.B., 2s; H. N. Humphreys, 3s 11d; Royston Green, 10s 6d; L. Rowan, 6s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; R.F.B., £3; 'L'Humanité, 5s; J. Rattray, 5s; H.S.M., 2s 6d; H. Willcox, 2s; O. Green, £2; F. Renouf, 5s; Cambridge C.P., £2 3s 8d; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 15s; H. Tinkler, 5s; R. McLeod, 5s; Director, £2; D.M., 6s; Socialist Sailor, £1; P. N. Brinson, 10s; J. Purton, 7s 6d.

Other contributions include:

E. J. Wargent, 8s; F. A. Hargreaves, 2s; 'Peace Meeting', 1s 6d; J. H. Hope, 8s; J. Walter, 3s; J. McLanachan, 8s; E. Newmark, 8s; R.P. (Canada), 10s 9d; J. Shaw, 8s; T.D.C., 8s; F.R., 8s; S. Gross, 3s; H. E. E. Godfrey, 2s 6d; J. G. Barker, 8s; E. Whitworth, 8s; A. C. Davies, £2; A. Idle, 8s; M.B., 5s; W. H. Miller, 8s; T. Graham, 8s; J. Sommerfield, 4s; W. Dickson, 3s; 'Audiex', 18s; 'Wycliff and Huss', £10; D. F. M. Parvin, 10s; H. F. Westney, 8s; E. P. Thompson, 5s; R. Eldridge, 4s; M. Mackenzie, 4s; C. G. Taff, 8s; A. J. Ramsey, 1s. 6d; H. Stringer, 2s; E. Williams, 8s; R. F. Haslam, 3s.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT.

Co-op. number L99482.

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIGHT ON

KOREA

by

D. N. PRITT

K.C.

All the facts

All the arguments

Price 3d.

READERS . . .
PLEASE NOTE!

Within 3 days of publication this sensationally successful 'Labour Monthly' pamphlet had to be reprinted. **To share out remaining supplies fairly, orders can only be fulfilled through newsagents, bookshops, etc., and in strict rotation.**

Ask at your local newsagent, or station bookstall, immediately.

NEWSAGENTS . . .
PLEASE NOTE!

If you have any 'unsolds', however few, they will be gratefully received by

The Manager,
'LABOUR MONTHLY',
134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

We will credit you with postage.

LABOUR RESEARCH

August issue includes:

"Development Councils"
"Coal Report"
"Schuman Plan"
"Profits from National Health"
"Should we nationalise Building?"

Monthly 6d.; p.a., 7s.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2 Soho Square, London, W.1.

OF LASTING VALUE

(1) There ARE no Aryans, by R. Page Arnot.
Race Theories exposed.
Price 6d.

(2) The Political Foundations of Karl Marx, by Roy Pascal.
An original study.
Price 1s.

From The Manager,
"Labour Monthly",
134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

NAME .....

(Please use Block Capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber to LABOUR MONTHLY and enclose 12/- (Home) $3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada), 13/- (Elsewhere Overseas) to cover 12 months' subscription beginning with the

.....issue.

Signed .....

Date .....

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED